

DETAILED ACTION

This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required. [The abstract in the PCT does not suffice].

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors, e.g., typographical, grammar, idiomatic, syntax and etc. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a). Claim 3 appears to be already covered in claim 1, steps b and c.
- b). The preamble of claim 4 reciting "A rouge free pharmaceutical water for injection purification system" provides for ambiguity as it could read on the product or material, rather than the system or apparatus to which the body of the claim is directed. See also claim 8. The same holds true also for the claimed " a water for injection storage tank " in claim 8, sections e.g., (i) and (j).

c). The inconsistent used of terminology such as “a water for injection storage tank”, in claim 8, as opposed to “the storage tank” in claim 9 is improper as it provides for confusion in the claims.

Claims 1-3 are objected to because of typographical error such as “distill ng” in claim 1, line 4.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williamson (3,420,747) or (Chekovich (3,119,752).

The claimed method which comprises: a. providing a source of water which is substantially free of carbon dioxide; b. distilling said water in an environment which is substantially free of carbon dioxide; and c. storing said distilled water in an environment which is substantially free of carbon dioxide in claim 1; and the claimed apparatus comprising: a water intake; b. a multi-effect still connected to said water intake, wherein said multi- effect still contains an internal controlled atmosphere which is substantially free of carbon dioxide; c. a connector for the passage of water from the multi-effect still to a water for injection storage tank; and d. a controlled atmosphere blanketing the water in the storage tank, wherein said controlled atmosphere is substantially free of carbon dioxide as claimed in claim 4 is rendered obvious at col 9, lines 14-26 of the Williamson reference or at cols. 3-6 of Checkovich’s reference. While not positively

recited, obviously the method and apparatus of the above references would prevent rouge in water and/or provide a rouge free pharmaceutical water as claimed inasmuch as the same method steps and features of the apparatus are shown by the prior art.

Claims 8 and 10/8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williamson (3,420,747) or Chekovich (3,119,752) in view of Heins (6,733,636).

Williamson or Chekovich is discussed supra. Heins is applied to teach that connecting a heat exchanger to a vapor compression still as claimed in sections (e) and (f) in claim 8 is conventional. Note col. 8, lines 30-33. To combine the references would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art since all the references are directed to the same processing environment i.e., to a distillation process wherein water is treated free of carbondioxide.

Claims 9, 10/9 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Roller discloses a deeration process in the treatment of a saline water.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to V. Manoharan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1450.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Calderola can be reached on (571) 272-1444.

Art Unit: 1797

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Virginia Manoharan/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797